UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/558,169	11/22/2005	Guenther Baschek	2003P03453WOUS	1917
22116 SIEMENS COF	7590 02/02/201 <b>RPORATION</b>	EXAMINER		
INTELLECTU	AL PROPERTY DEPA	ENIN-OKUT, EDU E		
ISELIN, NJ 088	/ENUE SOUTH 330		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
ŕ			1795	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/02/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.		Applicant(s)	
10/558,169		BASCHEK ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Edu E. Enin-Okut	1795	

	Edu E. Enin-Okut	1795	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	 ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>15 January 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS A		-	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of a eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavi al (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE ).	g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FII	on. LED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extender 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the siset forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount nortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exten Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wind AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	ut prior to the data of filing a brief	will not be entered be	001100
<ul> <li>(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further con</li> <li>(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below</li> </ul>	sideration and/or search (see NO¯ v);	ΓE below);	
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett	er form for appeal by materially red	ducing or simplifying tl	ne issues for
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1 <sup>2</sup>		ected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mpliant Amendment (l	PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):			
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowed non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>			
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		I be entered and an e	∢planation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>12,16 and 20-30</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
<u>AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE</u> 8.	before or on the date of filing a No	otice of Anneal will not	he entered
because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to over showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a
10.	of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ed.
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/Dah-Wei D. Yuan/	/Edu E. Enin-Okut/		
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1795	Examiner, Art Unit 1795		

Continuation of 3.

NOTE:

As to applicants' arguments filed on January 15, 2010 with respect the Suzuki reference, it is noted that "[t]he use of patents as references is not limited to what the patentees describe as their own inventions or to the problems with which they are concerned. They are part of the literature of the art, relevant for all they contain." In re Heck, 699 F.2d 1331, 1332-33, 216 USPQ 1038, 1039 (Fed. Cir. 1983). A reference may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill the art, including non-preferred embodiments. Merck & Co. v. Biocraft Laboratories, 874 F.2d 804, 10 USPQ2d 1843 (Fed. Cir.), cert. denied, 493 U.S. 975 (1989); Upsher-Smith Labs. v. Pamlab, LLC, 412 F.3d 1319, 1323, 75 USPQ2d 1213, 1215 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (reference disclosing optional inclusion of a particular component teaches compositions that both do and do not contain that component). See MPEP 2123 (I). Further, in response to applicants' arguments against the Suzuki reference individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See In re Keller, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); In re Merck & Co., 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

In addition, it is also noted that the Suzuki reference teaches "...The first hollow ridges and the second hollow ridges [of a separator unit composed of a first separator (with first hollow ridges and troughs) and a second separator (with second hollow ridges and troughs)] are not limited to any shapes insofar as they are shaped to allow the first and second troughs that communicate with each other to provide the communication passages [for cooling water] (emphasis added). ..." (see Suzuki, 3:21-51, 4:1-4). The reference also states that the bent and curved shapes depicted in its figures presented are preferred embodiments (see Suzuki, 4:5-50). Further, as to coolant flowing "laterally", Suzuki also teaches that "...the first troughs and the second troughs communicating with each other through the spaced portions of the crest surfaces of the first hollow ridges and the crest surfaces of the second hollow ridges, so that a coolant can flow through the first troughs and the second troughs which communicate with each other. ..." (see Suzuki, 5:20-26). Thus, one of ordinary skill in the art would appreciate that the coolant described in Suzuki moves laterally, as shown in the labeled figure from the reference presented on p. 4 of the previous Office Action.